

Naval Research Laboratory

Washington, DC 20375-5000



2

NRL Memorandum Report 6689

AD-A231 317

OPTIMAL HANKEL-NORM  
APPROXIMATION AND  
RATIONAL FUNCTION MODELS  
USING IMPULSE RESPONSE DATA

Charles K. Chui

Center for Approximation Theory  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843

for

Underwater Sound Reference Detachment  
Naval Research Laboratory  
P.O. Box 568337  
Orlando, FL 32856-8337

DTIC  
ELECTE  
JAN 24 1991  
S E D

27 December 1990

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<small>Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302 and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.</small>				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE 27 December 1990	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final report on theoretical work from Jun 89 to Jun 90		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Optimal Hankel-Norm Approximation and Rational Function Methods Using Impulse Response Data		5. FUNDING NUMBERS PE #62314N Task #RJ14-T21-OTO		
6. AUTHOR(S) Charles K. Chui		WU #59-0593-0-9/0 WU Assn #DN880-326 Contract N62190-89-M-1536		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Center for Approximation Theory Texas A&M University College Station, TX 77843		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER None		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Measurements Branch, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Naval Research Laboratory P.O. Box 568337 Orlando, FL 32856-8337		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NRL Memorandum Report 6689		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The motivation of this work is rational function modeling of transfer functions using impulse response data from underwater acoustic transducers. However, since such data does not, in general, correspond to a rational model even in the absence of noise, an effective rational function approximation criterion is necessary. In this report, the approximation error measure used is the Hankel-norm. Approximation using the Hankel-norm is a linear algebra method with an assured global minimum while the usual least-squares approximation is a nonlinear method satisfying only local minimum criteria. There are three outstanding features of this Hankel-norm approach: (1) the rational model is uniquely determined by the optimality criterion; (2) this rational model is guaranteed to be stable; and (3) the exact error approximation is given by a singular value of the corresponding Hankel operator and can be easily computed. The main contribution of this report is to extend Kung's model reduction algorithm to approximating systems not exactly described by rational function models of finite order and to requiring only the solution of simple, instead of generalized eigenvalue problems required in Kung's method.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Identification, transfer function modeling, impulse response, Hankel norm, AAK theory, Kung's model reduction algorithm, stable rational model, truncated Hankel operators			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 33	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified			16. PRICE CODE	
18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL		

(Blank Page)

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
KRONECKER'S THEOREM .....	2
Theorem 1. ( <i>Kronecker</i> ) .....	2
The ARMA Model.....	3
Algorithm I. (ARMA realization).....	4
Remarks .....	4
Proof .....	4
THE HANKEL NORM.....	4
Theorem 2. ( <i>Nehari</i> ).....	6
SINGULAR VALUES AND SINGULAR VECTORS .....	7
AAK THEORY.....	8
Theorem 3. ( <i>AAK</i> ).....	9
DISCUSSION OF AAK'S THEOREM .....	10
Step 1 .....	11
Step 2 .....	12
Step 3 .....	13
Step 4 .....	14
Step 5 .....	14
Remark.....	15
KUNG'S MODEL REDUCTION ALGORITHM.....	15
Algorithm II. ( <i>Kung</i> ).....	16
Proof .....	16
REFORMULATION OF OPTIMAL HANKEL-NORM	
RATIONAL MODEL .....	17
Theorem 4.....	18
Proof.....	18
TRUNCATED HANKEL OPERATORS .....	19
Theorem 5.....	20
ALGORITHM FOR OPTIMAL RATIONAL MODEL.....	20
Algorithm III.....	20
Proof.....	23
Remarks .....	24
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	25
REFERENCES.....	25
APPENDIX .....	27
Lemma 1 .....	27
Proof.....	27

(Blank Page)

# OPTIMAL HANKEL-NORM APPROXIMATION AND RATIONAL FUNCTION MODELS USING IMPULSE RESPONSE DATA

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

## INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the underlying mathematical formulations in systems theory and signal processing are quite similar [1,2]. In particular, the transfer function  $H(z)$ , with the sequence of unit impulse responses  $\{h_n\}$ , plays the central role of these two important areas of research. In the ideal situation when the sequence  $\{h_n\}$  is noise-free, then it is very easy to obtain the rational function model  $H(z)$ . One method is the use of Padé approximants. This method, being linear, is particularly simple. In systems theory, however, the dimension of the system, which agrees with the degree of the denominator of the rational function  $H(z)$ , although finite, may be unreasonably high. Hence, many model reduction methods have been introduced in the literature. All these methods amount to approximation of the rational function  $H(z)$  by another rational function with a much lower degree (or lower system dimension). However, only one method stands out to be the most desirable. This method, known as *optimal Hankel-norm approximation*, has three outstanding features: first, the lower-degree rational function approximant is uniquely determined by an optimal criterion; second, this rational function approximant is guaranteed to be stable; and third, the exact measurement of the error of approximation can be determined. The mathematical description and derivation of the optimal Hankel-norm approximation is especially intriguing. Based on the infinite-dimensional theory due to Adamjan, Arov, and Krein [3], better known as AAK, it relates best rational approximation in the supremum norm and optimal approximation of the corresponding Hankel operator by Hankel operators with specified finite rank. The intimate relation between rational functions and finite-rank Hankel operators is governed by the beautiful classical result due to Kronecker (cf. Ref. 4); and the relation between best rational approximation in the supremum norm and optimal Hankel approximation in the operator norm is initiated by a fundamental result due to Nehari [5]. The AAK theory may be considered as a generalization of Nehari's theorem in that the singular values are used to give the exact measurement of the error of approximation. Note that the first singular value agrees with the spectral radius, which is the same as the distance in the supremum norm of the transfer function from the Hardy space  $H^\infty$  of bounded analytic functions in the open unit disc. This is the main theorem due to Nehari.

Unfortunately, the AAK theory is very deep, and there seems to be no easy way to find the AAK optimal approximants. Nevertheless, when the transfer function is already a rational function, S.Y. Kung [6] gave an algorithm to compute the AAK optimal approximation. This method is called  $H^\infty$ -control (or systems reduction via Hankel approximation) in systems theory. However, even in the absence of noise, impulse response data from underwater acoustic transducers do not yield a rational model; and in general, data obtained from a rational model are contaminated with noise. Hence, for all practical purposes, the transfer function to be identified is *not* in the form of a rational function, and a rational approximation criterion is necessary. Recently, Chui, Li, and Ward [7,8] proved that if the truncated Hankel operators are used in place of the original Hankel operator (which represents the transfer function to be identified), then the AAK approximants of the truncated operators converge to the AAK approximant of the desired transfer function. We will derive a computational procedure based on this convergent result. In other

words, if a sequence  $\{h_n\}$  of unit impulse responses is given, we will derive a computational scheme to find the stable rational models that are optimal in the sense of best Hankel-norm approximation.

## KRONECKER'S THEOREM

Let  $\{h_n\}$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , be a causal sequence of unit impulse responses. Corresponding to this sequence, we associate two quantities: the  $z$ -transform, or symbol,

$$H(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n}, \quad (1)$$

and the infinite Hankel matrix  $\Gamma_H = [h_{i+\ell-1}]$ ,  $1 \leq i, \ell < \infty$ , or

$$\Gamma_H = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & h_3 & \ddots \\ h_2 & h_3 & \ddots & \\ h_3 & \ddots & & \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Note that we do not include  $h_0$  in the definition of  $\Gamma_H$  in (2) simply because of the standard convention in systems theory. The constant  $h_0$  is easy to determine since it is the limit of  $H(z)$  as  $z$  tends to infinity.

The rank of the matrix  $\Gamma_H$  is defined by the number of linearly independent columns of  $\Gamma_H$ ; or equivalently, it is the dimension of the range of  $\Gamma_H$  on  $\ell^2$ , where  $\ell^2$  denotes the space of square-summable sequences. The following classical result due to Kronecker can be found in [4]. A proof is included in the Appendix for easy reference.

### Theorem 1. (Kronecker)

*The infinite matrix  $\Gamma_H$  in (2) has finite rank if and only if the symbol*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} \quad (3)$$

*is a strictly proper rational function in  $z$ ; that is,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} = \frac{P(z)}{Q(z)} \quad (4)$$

*where  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are relatively prime polynomials in  $z$  with  $\text{degree}(P) < \text{degree}(Q)$ . Furthermore, in this situation,*

$$\text{rank}(\Gamma_H) = \text{degree}(Q). \quad (5)$$

In fact, if  $\Gamma_H$  has finite rank  $k$ , say, then the first  $k$  columns of  $\Gamma_H$  are linearly independent, and there exist  $k$  constants  $c_1, \dots, c_k$ , such that

$$\gamma_{k+\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \gamma_{i+\ell-1}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (6)$$

where  $\gamma_i$  denotes the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column of  $\Gamma_H$ . Furthermore, the finite square Hankel matrix

$$H_k = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \dots & h_k \\ h_2 & \dots & \dots & h_{k-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ h_k & \dots & \dots & h_{2k-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

which is a finite square truncation of  $\Gamma_H$ , is nonsingular. For more details, see Lemma 2.1 and its proof in [2] or the Appendix in this report.

## THE ARMA MODEL

A sequence  $\{h_n\}$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , is said to represent an ARMA model if its  $z$ -transform  $H(z)$  defined in (1) is a proper rational function in  $z$  with all its poles lying in the open unit disc  $|z| < 1$ , namely:

$$\begin{aligned} H(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} = \frac{b_0 + b_1 z^{-1} + \dots + b_M z^{-M}}{1 + a_1 z^{-1} + \dots + a_N z^{-N}} \\ &= \frac{b_0 z^p + b_1 z^{p-1} + \dots + b_p}{z^p + a_1 z^{p-1} + \dots + a_p} = \frac{\tilde{P}(z)}{Q(z)} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for arbitrary  $M, N \geq 0$ , where  $p = \max(M, N)$ ,  $b_{M+1} = \dots = b_p = 0$ ,  $a_{N+1} = \dots = a_p = 0$ ,

$$\text{degree}(\tilde{P}) \leq \text{degree}(Q) = p, \quad (9)$$

and

$$H(z) \text{ is analytic in } |z| \geq 1. \quad (10)$$

If  $\tilde{P}(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  have no common factors, we say that the representation (8) of  $H(z)$  is in *coprime form*. If (8) is in coprime form, then (10) is equivalent to

$$Q(z) \neq 0 \text{ for all } |z| \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

We remark that (10) is also equivalent to

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |h_n| < \infty. \quad (12)$$

In the following, we derive an algorithm to yield the *feedback sequence*  $\{a_n\}$  and *feed-forward sequence*  $\{b_n\}$  in (8) from the sequence of unit impulse responses  $\{h_n\}$ , assuming that its  $z$ -transform  $H(z)$  is known to be an ARMA model.



**Algorithm I. (ARMA realization)**

(1°) Solve for  $a_1, \dots, a_p$  in the linear matrix equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \dots & h_p \\ h_2 & & \dots & h_{p+1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ h_p & \dots & \dots & h_{2p-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_p \\ a_{p-1} \\ \vdots \\ a_1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} h_{p+1} \\ h_{p+2} \\ \vdots \\ h_{2p} \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (13)$$

(2°) Compute  $b_0, \dots, b_p$  by matrix-vector multiplication in:

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_0 \\ b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ a_1 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_p & \dots & a_1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h_0 \\ h_1 \\ \vdots \\ h_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_p$  have been computed in (13).

**Remarks:** From (7), with  $k = p$ , we see that the coefficient matrix of the matrix equation (13) (which is a finite Hankel matrix) is nonsingular. The coefficient matrix in (14) (which is a finite Toeplitz matrix) is a lower triangular matrix with unit diagonal.

**Proof:** Multiplying  $Q(z)$  to  $H(z)$  in (8), we have

$$(h_0 + h_1 z^{-1} + \dots)(z^p + a_1 z^{p-1} + \dots + a_p) = b_0 z^p + \dots + b_p. \quad (15)$$

Hence, equating the coefficients of  $z^p, z^{p-1}, \dots, z, 1$ , we have (14); and equating the coefficients of  $z^{-1}, \dots, z^{-p}$ , we have (13).

**THE HANKEL NORM**

As mentioned in the Introduction, we must assume for all practical purposes that  $H(z)$  is *not* a rational function. Hence, we usually start with a sequence  $\{h_n\}$  of unit impulse responses which satisfies  $\sum |h_n| < \infty$ . In fact, in most situations, we only have input/output information  $\{u_n\}/\{v_n\}$ . In this case, we write

$$H(e^{j\omega}) = \frac{\sum_m v_m e^{-jm\omega}}{\sum_m u_m e^{-jm\omega}}; \quad (16)$$

and numerically compute the unit impulse responses  $h_n$  by applying DFT to the integral

$$h_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H(e^{j\omega}) e^{jn\omega} d\omega. \quad (17)$$

We do not dwell on this, since it is expected that other more efficient procedures will be introduced in our forthcoming report [9], but only remark here that any numerical approximation method for determining  $\{h_n\}$  from (17) produces an error, which again necessarily results in a non-rational model  $H(z)$ ,  $z = e^{j\omega}$ .

Now, as a result of the condition  $\sum |h_n| < \infty$ , we have a bounded function  $H(z)$  on the unit circle  $|z| = 1$ . Hence, we may write

$$H(z) = H_a(z) + H_s(z), \quad (18)$$

where

$$H_a(z) = \left( \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} \right)_a = \sum_{n=-\infty}^0 h_n z^{-n} \quad (19)$$

is called the *analytic part* of  $H(z)$  and

$$H_s(z) = \left( \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} \right)_s = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} \quad (20)$$

is called the *singular part* of  $H(z)$ . Hence, the Hankel matrix  $\Gamma_H$  corresponding to  $H(z)$ , as defined in (2), is uniquely determined by the singular part  $H_s(z)$  of  $H(z)$ , while the analytic part  $H_a(z)$  of  $H(z)$  does not influence  $\Gamma_H$  at all. Now, under the hypothesis  $\sum |h_n| < \infty$ , which is equivalent to BIBO (bounded input - bounded output) stability, we may conclude that  $\Gamma_H$  is a *bounded* linear operator on the space  $\ell^2$  of all square-summable sequences, with the operator norm defined by

$$\|\Gamma_H\| = \sup\{\|\Gamma_H \mathbf{x}\|_{\ell^2} : \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\ell^2} = 1\}, \quad (21)$$

where, for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\ell^2} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (22)$$

The finiteness of  $\|\Gamma_H\|$  follows from Nehari's theorem to be stated below; and it will be seen that, in fact, we have

$$\left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \|\Gamma_H\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n|. \quad (23)$$

We will verify (23) after we state Nehari's theorem; but at this point it should be noted that  $\|\Gamma_H\|$  is the spectral radius of the operator  $\Gamma_H$ , or equivalently, the largest singular value of  $\Gamma_H$ .

The operator norm of  $\Gamma_H$  in (21) is also called the *Hankel norm* of the function  $H(z)$  and will be denoted by

$$\|H(z)\|_{\Gamma} = \|\Gamma_H\|. \quad (24)$$

Actually, this is not a true norm but only a semi-norm since

$$\|H(z)\|_{\Gamma} = \|H(z) - g(z)\|_{\Gamma} \quad (25)$$

for any function  $g(z) \in H^{\infty}$ . Here and throughout,  $H^{\infty}$  denotes the space of all bounded analytic functions in  $|z| < 1$ . It is also called a Hardy space. The importance of this observation is that it provides a motivation of the celebrated theorem due to Nehari [5].

**Theorem 2.** (Nehari)

Let  $H(z)$  be a bounded function defined on the unit circle  $|z| = 1$ . Then

$$\|H(z)\|_{\Gamma} = \inf_{g \in H^{\infty}} \|H(z) - g(z)\|_{L^{\infty}(|z|=1)}. \quad (26)$$

We now derive the inequalities in (23). First, note that  $\Gamma_H = \Gamma_{H_s}$ . By (26), with  $g(z) = 0$ , which is certainly in  $H^{\infty}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_H\| &= \|\Gamma_{H_s}\| = \|H_s(z)\|_{\Gamma} \leq \|H_s(z)\|_{L^{\infty}(|z|=1)} \\ &= \sup_{|z|=1} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n|. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This verifies the upper bound in (23). To verify the lower bound, let  $\mathbf{e}_1 = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$ , which has unit  $\ell^2$  norm so that from the definition (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_H\| &\geq \|\Gamma_H \mathbf{e}_1\|_{\ell^2} \\ &= \|(h_1, h_2, \dots)\|_{\ell^2} = \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In the above formulation, we have also established that the Hankel norm lies between the  $L^{\infty}(|z|=1)$  and  $L^2(|z|=1)$  norms. Recall that

$$\|f\|_{L^{\infty}(|z|=1)} = \sup_{|z|=1} |f(z)|, \quad (29)$$

which has already been used in (26) and (27), and that

$$\|f\|_{L^2(|z|=1)} = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(e^{j\omega})|^2 d\omega \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (30)$$

Indeed, by the isometry between  $\ell^2$  and  $L^2(|z|=1)$  we have the lower bound, and by the application of Nehari's theorem as in (27) we have the upper bound; that is,

$$\|H_s\|_{L^2(|z|=1)} \leq \|H_s\|_{\Gamma} \leq \|H_s\|_{L^{\infty}(|z|=1)}. \quad (31)$$

## SINGULAR VALUES AND SINGULAR VECTORS

Let  $\Gamma_H$  be an infinite Hankel matrix as defined in (2). Under the assumption that  $\sum |h_n| < \infty$ , we have seen that  $\Gamma_H$  can be considered as a *bounded linear operator* on  $\ell^2$ . For simplicity, we will call  $\Gamma_H$  a *Hankel operator*. Since all Hankel operators are symmetric, the adjoint of  $\Gamma_H$  is its complex conjugate

$$\bar{\Gamma}_H = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{h}_1 & \bar{h}_2 & \bar{h}_3 & & \\ \bar{h}_2 & \bar{h}_3 & & \ddots & \\ \bar{h}_3 & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

In particular, for a sequence of real-valued unit impulse responses,  $\Gamma_H$  is self-adjoint. In any case,  $\Gamma_H \bar{\Gamma}_H$  is non-negative definite and has non-negative eigenvalues  $s_1^2, s_2^2, \dots$ , with  $s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ , which are arranged in nonincreasing order, listing all multiple occurrences. Let  $|\Gamma_H|$  denote the non-negative square-root of  $\Gamma_H \bar{\Gamma}_H$ . Note that although  $|\Gamma_H|$  is Hermitian, it may *not* be Hankel; but this is not important in the following discussions. Clearly, the eigenvalues of  $|\Gamma_H|$  are  $s_1, s_2, \dots$ . Corresponding to each  $s_n$ , let  $\mathbf{x}_n$  be an eigenvector of  $|\Gamma_H|$ ; that is,  $\mathbf{x}_n \neq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_n \in \ell^2$ , and

$$|\Gamma_H| \mathbf{x}_n = s_n \mathbf{x}_n. \quad (33)$$

Let  $U$  be an *unitary operator* on  $\ell^2$  such that

$$\Gamma_H = U |\Gamma_H| \quad (34)$$

(cf. Ref. 10). Then by defining

$$\begin{cases} \xi_n = \mathbf{x}_n \\ \eta_n = U \mathbf{x}_n, \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

we see that

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_H \xi_n = s_n \eta_n \\ \bar{\Gamma}_H \eta_n = s_n \xi_n. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Indeed, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_H \xi_n &= U |\Gamma_H| \xi_n \\ &= s_n U \xi_n = s_n \eta_n \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}_H \eta_n &= \bar{\Gamma}_H U \xi_n \\ &= (\bar{U}^T \Gamma_H)^T \xi_n \\ &= |\Gamma_H|^T \xi_n = |\Gamma_H| \mathbf{x}_n \\ &= s_n \mathbf{x}_n = s_n \xi_n. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

We will call  $s_n$  a *singular value* (or *s-number*) of  $\Gamma_H$  and will call the pair  $(\xi_n, \eta_n)$  a *singular vector pair* (or *Schmidt pair*) of  $\Gamma_H$  relative to  $s_n$ . Let us assume, without loss of generality, that the eigenvectors  $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots\}$  of  $|\Gamma_H|$  corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots\}$  are orthonormalized, so that the infinite matrix

$$V = [\mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{x}_2 \dots], \quad (39)$$

with  $\mathbf{x}_n$  as its  $n^{\text{th}}$  column, is a unitary operator in  $\ell^2$ . Then, by the definition of eigenvalues and eigenvectors, we have

$$|\Gamma_H|V = V\Sigma, \quad (40)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \text{diag}(s_1, s_2, \dots) = \begin{bmatrix} s_1 & & \circ \\ & s_2 & \\ & \circ & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

is the diagonal matrix of the singular values of  $\Gamma_H$ . Hence, it follows from (34) that

$$\Gamma_H = (UV)\Sigma V^* \quad (42)$$

where  $V^*$  is the adjoint (or complex conjugate of the transpose) of  $V$ , and both  $(UV)$  and  $V^*$  are unitary operators. The decomposition (42) is called a *singular value decomposition* of  $\Gamma_H$ . (For finite matrices, see Ref. 11.) Another formulation of (42) is the so-called *Schmidt series* representation

$$\Gamma_H = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n \eta_n \xi_n^*, \quad (43)$$

which follows from (42) and (35); where again,  $\xi_n^*$  denotes the complex conjugate of the transpose of the vector  $\xi_n$ , so that  $\eta_n \xi_n^*$  is a rank-1 operator on  $\ell^2$ . That is,  $\Gamma_H$  is the (strong) limit of the sequence of finite sums

$$\sum_{n=1}^p s_n \eta_n \xi_n^* \quad (44)$$

(which are rank  $p$  operators), as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ . "Strongness" here means convergence in the operator norm defined in (26). However, although the operators in (44) are finite-rank operators that approximate  $\Gamma_H$ , they are *not* Hankel operators, and consequently, are useless for our purpose of finding rational models for  $H(z)$  (see Theorem 1).

## AAK THEORY

Let  $H(z)$  and  $\Gamma_H$  be defined as in (1) and (2) where the sequence  $\{h_n\}$  of unit impulse responses is assumed to be in  $\ell^1$ ; that is,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n| < \infty. \quad (45)$$

Let  $s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$  denote the singular values of  $\Gamma_H$  with corresponding singular vector pairs  $(\xi_1, \eta_1), (\xi_2, \eta_2), \dots$ , respectively. Since  $s_1$  is the largest singular value, it is the spectral radius of  $\Gamma$ , so that we have  $s_1 = \|\Gamma_H\|$ . Hence, as a consequence of Nehari's theorem (cf. Theorem 2), we have

$$s_1 = \|\Gamma_H\| = \inf_{g \in H^\infty} \|H(z) - g(z)\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)}. \quad (46)$$

That is, the first singular value  $s_1$  yields the exact measurement of the error of uniform approximation on  $|z| = 1$  of  $H(z)$  from the Hardy space  $H^\infty$ . That is why Nehari's result is considered to be the starting point of the area of  $H^\infty$ -control (cf. Ref. 12). To yield rational models, we introduce the notation:

$$\mathcal{R}_p^s = \left\{ \frac{P(z)}{Q(z)} : \deg P(z) < \deg Q(z) \leq p, \quad Q(z) \neq 0 \text{ for } |z| \geq 1 \right\} \quad (47)$$

where  $P, Q$  are polynomials. That is,  $\mathcal{R}_p^s$  is the collection of all stable proper rational functions of degree at most  $p$ . Also, let

$$H_p^\infty = H^\infty + \mathcal{R}_p^s \quad (48)$$

denote the collection of all functions  $f(z) = g(z) + r(z)$  where  $g(z) \in H^\infty$  and  $r(z) \in \mathcal{R}_p^s$ . To unify notations, we set

$$H^\infty = H_0^\infty, \quad \mathcal{R}_0^s = \{0\}. \quad (49)$$

To pose the approximation problem in terms of operators, let  $G_p$  denote the collection of all bounded Hankel operators with rank  $\leq p$ . Hence,  $G_0$  consists only of the zero matrix. By Kronecker's theorem (cf. Theorem 1) and the equivalence of (11) to the boundedness of the corresponding Hankel operators, we may identify  $\mathcal{R}_p^s$  with  $G_p$ .

Hence, Nehari's theorem (cf. Theorem 2) formulated as in (46) can be written as:

$$s_1 = \inf_{\Lambda \in G_0} \|\Gamma_H - \Lambda\| = \inf_{g \in H_0^\infty} \|H(z) - g(z)\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)}. \quad (50)$$

Here, since  $G_0 = \{0\}$ , the first equality only says  $s_1 = \|\Gamma_H\|$ . The celebrated result of AAK in [3] is to generalize (50) from  $p = 0$  to an arbitrary positive integer  $p$ .

### Theorem 3. (AAK)

Let  $H(z)$  be any function in  $L^\infty(|z| = 1)$  and  $p$  be any non-negative integer. Then

$$s_{p+1} = \inf_{\Lambda \in G_p} \|\Gamma_H - \Lambda\| = \inf_{g \in H_p^\infty} \|H(z) - g(z)\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)}. \quad (51)$$

Hence, the  $(p+1)^{\text{st}}$  singular value of  $\Gamma_H$  gives the exact measurement of the distance in uniform norm on  $|z| = 1$  of  $H(z)$  from  $H_p^\infty$ . In addition, since  $\Gamma_H$  is a compact operator under the assumption (45), we have

$$s_{p+1} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \infty \quad (52)$$

(cf. Ref. 13). That is, we can approximate  $H(z)$  as close as we wish from  $H_p^\infty$ . So, if the Hankel norm defined in (24) is used, then in view of (25), the  $H^\infty$  or analytic part of

the approximant is irrelevant. Thus, by taking the singular part  $[ ]_s$ , we obtain a *stable rational model* of  $H(z)$

To be more specific, we exhibit the formulation of the best Hankel-norm approximant. The following notations are needed. Let

$$\xi_{p+1} = (u_1^{(p+1)}, u_2^{(p+1)}, \dots), \quad \eta_{p+1} = (v_1^{(p+1)}, v_2^{(p+1)}, \dots) \quad (53)$$

be a singular vector pair of  $\Gamma_H$  corresponding to the  $(p+1)^{\text{st}}$  singular value  $s_{p+1}$  of  $\Gamma_H$ . Define the analytic and singular functions:

$$\begin{cases} \xi_{p+1}^+(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i^{(p+1)} z^{i-1} \\ \eta_{p+1}^-(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v_i^{(p+1)} z^{-i} \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

respectively, and set

$$\hat{g}_p(z) = H(z) - s_{p+1} \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)}. \quad (55)$$

In the AAK paper [3], it is proved that  $\hat{g}_p(z)$  is in  $H_p^\infty$  and solves the optimal approximation problem (51) in the sense that

$$s_{p+1} = \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_{\hat{g}_p}\| = \|H(z) - \hat{g}_p(z)\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)}. \quad (56)$$

As we remarked above, since

$$\Gamma_{\hat{g}_p} = \Gamma_{[\hat{g}_p]_s} \quad (57)$$

where  $[\hat{g}_p]_s$  denotes the singular part of  $\hat{g}_p$ , we may conclude that

$$s_{p+1} = \|H - [\hat{g}_p]_s\|_\Gamma = \inf_{g \in H_p^\infty} \|H(z) - g(z)\|_\Gamma; \quad (58)$$

and this means that the singular part of  $\hat{g}_p(z)$ , defined by

$$\hat{R}_p(z) = [\hat{g}_p(z)]_s, \quad (59)$$

provides an optimal *stable rational approximation* of  $H(z)$  from  $\mathcal{R}_p^s$ . The proof of this result is very deep; but if  $H(z)$  itself is also a rational model, a simpler derivation is accessible. We will outline this simpler version in the next section. The reason for doing so is that S.Y. Kung's model reduction algorithm, which will be discussed in this report, is based on this derivation.

## DISCUSSION OF AAK'S THEOREM

We will outline the proof of AAK's theorem (cf. Theorem 3) for the special case where  $H(z) = \sum h_n z^{-n}$  has real coefficients and the singular part  $[H(z)]_s = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n}$  of  $H(z)$  is a strictly proper rational function, namely:

$$[H(z)]_s = H_s(z) = \frac{P_{M-1}(z)}{Q_M(z)}, \quad (60)$$

with degree  $(P_{M-1}) < \text{degree}(Q_M) = M$ , and  $P_{M-1}(z), Q_M(z)$  being relatively prime. Note that  $H_s(z) \in \mathcal{R}_M^s$  since  $\Gamma_H$  is a bounded Hankel operator.

Let  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^M$  be the (necessarily non-zero) eigenvalues of the real rank- $M$  Hankel matrix  $\Gamma_H$ . We arrange these eigenvalues in such a way that  $|\lambda_i| = s_i$ ; hence,

$$|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_M| > 0, \quad (61)$$

where  $s_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  singular value of  $\Gamma_H$ . (Note that since  $\Gamma_H$  is real,  $\bar{\Gamma}_H \Gamma_H = \Gamma_H^2$ ; and this gives  $s_i^2 = \lambda_i^2$ .) Let  $\mathbf{x}_i$  be the eigenvector of  $\Gamma_H$  corresponding to  $\lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . Then since  $s_i = |\lambda_i| = \lambda_i(\text{sgn } \lambda_i)$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_H \xi_i = s_i \eta_i \\ \bar{\Gamma}_H \eta_i = s_i \xi_i \end{cases}, \quad (62)$$

where  $\xi_i = \mathbf{x}_i$  and  $\eta_i = (\text{sgn } \lambda_i) \mathbf{x}_i$ . That is,  $(\mathbf{x}_i, (\text{sgn } \lambda_i) \mathbf{x}_i) = (\xi_i, \eta_i)$  is a singular vector pair of  $\Gamma_H$  relative to the singular value  $s_i = |\lambda_i|$ .

Let  $p < M$ , and our goal be to replace  $H_s(z) = P_{M-1}(z)/Q_M(z)$  by a rational function in  $\mathcal{R}_p^s$ . The notations introduced in (53) and (54) are now used.

**Step 1.** We claim that

$$\tilde{H}(z) = H_s(z) \xi_{p+1}^+(z) - s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1}^-(z) \quad (63)$$

is analytic in  $|z| < 1$ ; that is  $[\tilde{H}(z)]_s = 0$ . To see this, first observe that

$$s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1} = \lambda_{p+1} \xi_{p+1} \quad (64)$$

so that

$$s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1}^-(z) = \lambda_{p+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i^{(p+1)} z^{-i}. \quad (65)$$

Second, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_i u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} z^{\ell-i-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{i+\ell-1} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} z^{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{\ell-i+1} u_{\ell+1}^{(p+1)} z^{i-1} \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where  $h_{\ell} = 0$  for  $\ell \leq 0$ . Finally, from  $\Gamma_H \xi_{p+1} = \lambda_{p+1} \xi_{p+1}$ , we have

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{i+\ell-1} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} = \lambda_{p+1} u_i^{(p+1)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (67)$$



Hence, we may conclude, by applying (64), (65), (66), and (67) consecutively, that

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\tilde{H}(z)]_s &= [H_s(z)\xi_{p+1}^+(z) - s_{p+1}\eta_{p+1}^-(z)]_s \\
 &= [H_s(z)\xi_{p+1}^+(z) - \lambda_{p+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i^{(p+1)} z^{-i}]_s \\
 &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{i+\ell-1} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} z^{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{\ell-i+1} u_{\ell+1}^{(p+1)} z^{i-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{p+1} u_i^{(p+1)} z^{-i} \right]_s \\
 &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=i}^{\infty} h_{\ell-i+1} u_{\ell+1}^{(p+1)} z^{i-1} \right]_s \\
 &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^{\infty} h_i u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} z^{\ell-i-1} \right]_s = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

**Step 2.** We claim that the function

$$B(z) = Q_M(z)\eta_{p+1}^-(z) \tag{69}$$

is a polynomial with real coefficients and of degree  $\leq M-1$ .

It is clear that  $B(z)$  has real coefficients. We first observe that since  $P_{M-1}(z)$  and  $\xi_{p+1}^+(z)$  have only positive powers, we have

$$[P_{M-1}(z)\xi_{p+1}^+(z)]_s = 0. \tag{70}$$

Hence, it follows from Step 1 (cf. Eq. (63)) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 [B(z)]_s &= [Q_M(z)\eta_{p+1}^-(z)]_s \\
 &= -\frac{1}{s_{p+1}} [P_{M-1}(z)\xi_{p+1}^+(z) - s_{p+1}Q_M(z)\eta_{p+1}^-(z)]_s \\
 &= -\frac{1}{s_{p+1}} [Q_M(z)\{H_s(z)\xi_{p+1}^+(z) - s_{p+1}\eta_{p+1}^-(z)\}]_s \\
 &= -\frac{1}{s_{p+1}} [Q_M(z)\tilde{H}(z)]_s = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

That is,  $B(z)$  is analytic and by the definition (69), it must be a polynomial. Now, since

$$\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B(z)}{Q_M(z)} = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{p+1}^-(z) = 0, \tag{72}$$

we have  $\text{degree}(B) < \text{degree}(Q_M)$ , so that the degree of  $B(z)$  is at most  $M-1$ .

**Step 3.** Let  $B^*(z)$  and  $Q_M^*(z)$  be the reciprocal polynomials relative to  $B(z)$  and  $Q_M(z)$ , respectively; that is,

$$B^*(z) = z^{M-1} \overline{B\left(\frac{1}{\bar{z}}\right)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_M^*(z) = z^M \overline{Q_M\left(\frac{1}{\bar{z}}\right)}. \quad (73)$$

We claim that the function

$$C(z) = \frac{P_{M-1}(z)B^*(z) - \lambda_{p+1}Q_M^*(z)B(z)}{Q_M(z)} \quad (74)$$

is a polynomial with real coefficients and of degree  $\leq M-1$ .

Indeed, since  $P_{M-1}(z)B^*(z) - \lambda_{p+1}Q_M^*(z)B(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $\leq 2M-1$ , we may use partial fractions to write

$$\frac{P_{M-1}(z)B^*(z) - \lambda_{p+1}Q_M^*(z)B(z)}{Q_M(z)Q_M^*(z)} = \frac{C(z)}{Q_M^*(z)} + \frac{D(z)}{Q_M(z)} \quad (75)$$

for some polynomials  $C(z)$  and  $D(z)$  of degree  $\leq M-1$ . However, since  $Q_M(z)$  has all its zeros in  $|z| < 1$ , its reciprocal polynomial  $Q_M^*(z)$  has all its zeros in  $|z| > 1$ , so that

$$\frac{1}{Q_M(z)} = z^{-M} \frac{1}{Q_M^*\left(\frac{1}{\bar{z}}\right)} = z^{-M} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_i z^{-i} \quad (76)$$

for some  $q_0, q_1, \dots$ . Hence, if degree  $(D) \leq M-1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{D(z)}{Q_M(z)} \right]_s &= \left[ z^{-M} D(z) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_i z^{-i} \right]_s \\ &= z^{-M} D(z) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_i z^{-i} = \frac{D(z)}{Q_M(z)}. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

On the other hand, since  $Q_M^*(z)$  is analytic in  $|z| < 1$ , we have

$$\left[ \frac{C(z)}{Q_M^*(z)} \right]_s = 0. \quad (78)$$

Now, in view of Step 1, namely:  $[\tilde{H}(z)]_s = 0$ , we may apply (69) in Step 2 to verify that

$$\left[ \frac{P_{M-1}(z)B^*(z) - \lambda_{p+1}Q_M^*(z)B(z)}{Q_M(z)Q_M^*(z)} \right]_s = 0, \quad (79)$$

so that by combining (77), (78), and (79) in (75), we have  $D(z) = 0$ . This verifies (74).

**Step 4.** Let  $\widehat{R}_p(z)$  be defined as in (59). We claim that

$$\widehat{R}_p(z) = \left[ \frac{C(z)}{B^*(z)} \right]_s. \quad (80)$$

Indeed, from (74), we have

$$\frac{C(z)}{B^*(z)} = H(z) - \lambda_{p+1} \frac{B(z)/Q_M(z)}{B^*(z)/Q_M^*(z)}. \quad (81)$$

Here, from the relations (69) and (64), it can be shown that

$$\left[ \lambda_{p+1} \frac{B(z)/Q_M(z)}{B^*(z)/Q_M^*(z)} \right]_s = s_{p+1} \left[ \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)} \right]_s. \quad (82)$$

Therefore, in view of the definitions in (55) and (59), we have obtained (80).

**Step 5.** We can now complete the proof of the AAK theorem (cf. Theorem 3), for the special case of real and finite-rank Hankel operators  $\Gamma_H$ , by verifying (56), or equivalently:

$$s_{p+1} = \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_{\widehat{R}_p}\|. \quad (83)$$

First, we remark that  $\eta_{p+1}^-(z)/\xi_{p+1}^+(z)$  is a constant  $c$  multiple of a Blaschke product with  $|c| = 1$ , so that

$$\left\| \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)} \right\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)} = 1. \quad (84)$$

Therefore, from (55) and (31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_{\widehat{R}_p}\| &= \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_{\hat{g}_p}\| \\ &= \|H - \hat{g}_p\|_\Gamma = s_{p+1} \left\| \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-}{\xi_{p+1}^+} \right\|_\Gamma \\ &\leq s_{p+1} \left\| \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)} \right\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)} = s_{p+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} [(H_s(z) - \widehat{R}_p(s))\xi_{p+1}^+(z)]_s &= s_{p+1} \left[ \left[ \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)} \right]_s \xi_{p+1}^+(z) \right]_s \\ &= s_{p+1} \left[ \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)} \xi_{p+1}^+(z) \right]_s = s_{p+1} [\eta_{p+1}^-(z)]_s \\ &= s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1}^-(z), \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

we have

$$\Gamma_{H-\hat{R}_p} \xi_{p+1} = (\Gamma_h - \Gamma_{\hat{R}_p}) \xi_{p+1} = s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1}, \quad (87)$$

so that

$$\bar{\Gamma}_{H-\hat{R}_p} \eta_{p+1} = s_{p+1} \xi_{p+1}. \quad (88)$$

That is,  $(s_{p+1}, (\xi_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}))$  is also a (singular value, singular vectors) pair of  $\Gamma_{H-\hat{R}_p}$ . Hence,  $s_{p+1}$  does not exceed its spectral radius, namely:

$$s_{p+1} \leq \|\Gamma_{H-\hat{R}_p}\| = \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_{\hat{R}_p}\|. \quad (89)$$

Therefore, by combining (85) and (89), we have proved (83).

**Remark.** From (80), it seems that  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  is a rational function in  $\mathcal{R}_{M-1}^s$ . Actually, we have now proved that  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  is in  $\mathcal{R}_p^s$ , where  $p \leq M-1$ . This means that only the  $p$  zeros of  $B^*(z)$  that lie in  $|z| < 1$  are used to yield  $\hat{R}_p$ . The results in Steps 2, 3, and 4 are useful in the following discussion of Kung's model reduction algorithm.

## KUNG'S MODEL REDUCTION ALGORITHM

Let  $H_s(z) = P_{M-1}(z)/Q_M(z)$  be defined as in (60) where  $P_{M-1}(z)$  and  $Q_M(z)$  are coprime polynomials with degree  $(P_{M-1}) < \text{degree}(Q_M) = M$ . Let  $Q_M^*(z)$  be the reciprocal polynomial relative to  $Q_M(z)$  as defined in (73). Since  $H_s(z)$  is in  $\mathcal{R}_M^s$ , all the  $M$  zeros of  $Q_M(z)$  lie in  $|z| < 1$ , so that all the  $M$  zeros of  $Q_M^*(z)$  lie in  $|z| > 1$ . That is,

$$\frac{Q_M^*(z)}{Q_M(z)} = q_0 + q_1 z^{-1} + q_2 z^{-2} + \dots \quad (90)$$

is the reciprocal of a finite Blaschke product.

We need the following notations:

$$H_M = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \dots & h_M \\ h_2 & \dots & \dots & h_{M+1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ h_M & \dots & \dots & h_{2M-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (91)$$

$$K_M = \begin{bmatrix} q_M & q_{M-1} & \dots & q_1 \\ q_{M+1} & q_M & \dots & q_2 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ q_{2M-1} & q_{2M-2} & \dots & q_M \end{bmatrix} \quad (92)$$

$$H_\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & h_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & h_1 & \dots & h_{M-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (93)$$

Chui

$$K_{\Delta} = \begin{bmatrix} q_0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ q_1 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ q_{M-1} & \dots & q_1 & q_0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (94)$$

where  $H_M, H_{\Delta}$  are finite Hankel matrices and  $K_M, K_{\Delta}$  are finite Toeplitz matrices. (Note that the notations in (90) and (7) agree.)

**Algorithm II.** (Kung)

(1°) Solve the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$(H_M - \lambda K_M)q = 0 \quad (95)$$

for  $\{\lambda_i, q^i\}$ , where  $\{q^1, \dots, q^M\}$  are linearly independent and

$$|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_M|. \quad (96)$$

(2°) For  $1 \leq p < M$ , perform the matrix-vector multiplication:

$$r^{p+1} = (H_{\Delta} - \lambda_{p+1} K_{\Delta})q^{p+1}. \quad (97)$$

(3°) Set

$$\begin{cases} r^{p+1} = (b_0, \dots, b_{M-1}) \\ q^{p+1} = (a_0, \dots, a_{M-1}) \end{cases}, \quad (98)$$

and compute the singular part

$$\hat{R}_p(z) = \left[ \frac{b_0 z^{M-1} + \dots + b_{M-1}}{a_0 + a_1 z + \dots + a_{M-1} z^{M-1}} \right]_s. \quad (99)$$

(In this computation, factorize  $a_0 + a_1 z + \dots + a_{M-1} z^{M-1}$  into  $M - 1$  linear factors and discard those terms whose roots do not lie in  $|z| < 1$ . We note that exactly  $p$  linear factors, counting multiplicities, are retained. Now use partial fraction expansion to determine  $\hat{R}_p(z)$ .)

**Proof.** Let

$$H^M = \begin{bmatrix} h_{M+1} & h_{M+2} & \dots & h_{2M} \\ h_{M+2} & \dots & \dots & h_{2M+1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ h_{2M} & \dots & \dots & h_{3M-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (100)$$

and

$$K^M = \begin{bmatrix} q_{2M} & q_{2M-1} & \dots & q_{M+1} \\ q_{2M+1} & q_{2M} & \dots & q_{M+2} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ q_{3M-1} & q_{3M-2} & \dots & q_{2M} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (101)$$

where  $H^M$  is a finite Hankel matrix and  $K^M$  a finite Toeplitz matrix. Set

$$\begin{cases} C(z) = b_0 z^{M-1} + \dots + b_{M-1} \\ B(z) = a_0 z^{M-1} + \dots + a_{M-1} \end{cases}, \quad (102)$$

so that

$$B^*(z) = a_0 + a_1 z + \dots + a_{M-1} z^{M-1}. \quad (103)$$

Then it is straightforward to check that the identity (74) in Step 3 in the proof of AAK's theorem is equivalent to the matrix system

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_\Delta \\ \dots \\ H_M \\ \dots \\ H^M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_0 \\ \vdots \\ a_{M-1} \end{bmatrix} - \lambda_{p+1} \begin{bmatrix} K_\Delta \\ \dots \\ K_M \\ \dots \\ K^M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_0 \\ \vdots \\ a_{M-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b_0 \\ \vdots \\ b_{M-1} \\ \dots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (104)$$

Also, (104) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} [H_\Delta - \lambda_{p+1} K_\Delta] \mathbf{q}^{(p+1)} = \mathbf{r}^{(p+1)} \\ [H_M - \lambda_{p+1} K_M] \mathbf{q}^{(p+1)} = \mathbf{0} \\ [H^M - \lambda_{p+1} K^M] \mathbf{q}^{(p+1)} = \mathbf{0} \end{cases}, \quad (105)$$

where the notations in (98) are used. The second equation in (105) is Step (1°) in Algorithm II, while the first equation in (105) is Step (2°) in the algorithm. Note that the third equation in (105) is a consequence of the second equation by the Caley-Hamilton theorem in matrix theory. Now, the result  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  computed in Step (3°) of the algorithm agrees with  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  in (80); and hence, by AAK's theorem (cf. argument in Step 5 in the above section), we may conclude that  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  satisfies (83).

## REFORMULATION OF OPTIMAL HANKEL-NORM RATIONAL MODEL

We have seen that Toeplitz matrices also occur in the computation of the rational model  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  in Kung's algorithm. In fact, a Toeplitz matrix associated with the transfer function  $H(z)$  can be used to describe  $\hat{R}_p(z)$ . Let

$$T_H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & h_1 & h_2 & h_3 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & h_1 & h_2 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & h_1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{bmatrix} \quad (106)$$

be an upper triangular infinite Toeplitz matrix with zero main diagonal. As in (61), let  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^M$  denote the (necessarily non-zero) eigenvalues of the rank- $M$  Hankel operator  $\Gamma_H$  such that  $|\lambda_i| = s_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  singular value of  $\Gamma_H$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . As before, let

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \xi_i = (u_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, \dots) \quad (107)$$

denote an eigenvector of  $\Gamma_H$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ , so that  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ , with  $\eta_i = (\text{sgn } \lambda_i) \mathbf{x}_i$ , is a singular vector pair of  $\Gamma_H$  corresponding to the singular value  $s_i = |\lambda_i|$  (cf. Eq. (62)). Also, let  $\hat{g}_p(z)$  be as in (55) and  $\hat{R}_p(z) = [\hat{g}_p(z)]_s$  be the optimal solution in best Hankel-norm approximation of  $H(z)$  from  $\mathcal{R}_p^s$ . Then we have the following result.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $H(z)$  be a transfer function with real coefficients such that its singular part  $H_s(z)$  is given as in (60). Then*

$$\hat{R}_p(z) = \left[ \frac{(1, z, z^2, \dots) \cdot T_H \mathbf{x}_{p+1}}{(1, z, z^2, \dots) \cdot \mathbf{x}_{p+1}} \right]_s. \quad (108)$$

**Proof.** From the equation  $\Gamma_H \mathbf{x}_{p+1} = \lambda_{p+1} \mathbf{x}_{p+1}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_{i+\ell-1} u_i^{(p+1)} = \lambda_{p+1} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots; \quad (109)$$

and hence, by (65), it follows that

$$s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1}^-(z) = \lambda_{p+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i^{(p+1)} z^{-i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{i+\ell-1} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} \right) z^{-i}. \quad (110)$$

This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & H_s(z) \xi_{p+1}^+(z) - s_{p+1} \eta_{p+1}^-(z) \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i z^{-i} \right) \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} z^{\ell-1} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{i+\ell-1} u_{\ell}^{(p+1)} \right) z^{-i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{\ell=i+1}^{\infty} h_{\ell-i} u_{\ell+1}^{(p+1)} \right) z^i \\ &= (1, z, z^2, \dots) \cdot T_f \mathbf{x}_{p+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

Since  $\xi_{p+1}^+(z) = (1, z, z^2, \dots) \cdot \mathbf{x}_{p+1}$ , we have

$$H_s(z) - s_{p+1} \frac{\eta_{p+1}^-(z)}{\xi_{p+1}^+(z)} = \frac{(1, z, z^2, \dots) \cdot T_f \mathbf{x}_{p+1}}{(1, z, z^2, \dots) \cdot \mathbf{x}_{p+1}},$$

so that by (59) and (55), which was proved by AAK [3] in general and in this report for our special case, we have obtained (108).

## TRUNCATED HANKEL OPERATORS

To apply Kung's algorithm, it is essential to start with an ARMA model. However, as we mentioned before, in all practical purposes in underwater acoustic signal processing, the sequence  $\{h_n\}$  of unit impulse responses which may be computed from input/output measurements (cf. Eqs. (16) and (17), for instance), is both physically and numerically noisy. Hence, the measured transfer function  $H(z)$  cannot be ARMA or the Hankel operator  $\Gamma_H$  has infinite rank. In a recent work [7], the truncated (infinite) Hankel operators

$$\Gamma_H^n = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \dots & h_n & 0 \\ & h_2 & & & \\ & \vdots & & & \\ & \vdots & & & \\ h_n & & & & \\ & & & & \\ 0 & & & & \bigcirc \end{bmatrix} \quad (112)$$

are introduced and optimal Hankel-norm approximants  $\hat{R}_p^n(z)$  of

$$H_n(z) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^n h_i z^{-i} \quad (113)$$

are used to replace the optimal Hankel-norm approximant  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  of

$$H(z) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} h_i z^{-i}. \quad (114)$$

Recall that this means:

$$\begin{cases} s_{p+1}^{(n)} = \|H_n(z) - \hat{R}_p^n(z)\|_{\Gamma} = \inf_{R(z) \in \mathcal{R}_p} \|H_n(z) - R(z)\|_{\Gamma} \\ s_{p+1} = \|H(z) - \hat{R}_p(z)\|_{\Gamma} = \inf_{R(z) \in \mathcal{R}_p} \|H(z) - R(z)\|_{\Gamma} \end{cases}, \quad (115)$$

where  $s_1^{(n)} \geq s_2^{(n)} \geq \dots$  are the singular values of  $\Gamma_{H_n} = \Gamma_H^n$ . It is at least intuitively clear that

$$s_{p+1}^{(n)} \longrightarrow s_{p+1} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty; \quad (116)$$



and in [8], we have proved much more.

**Theorem 5.** *For each  $p$ , there exists a positive constant  $C_p$ , such that*

$$\|\hat{R}_p^n(z) - \hat{R}_p(z)\|_{L^\infty(|z|=1)} \leq C_p \left\{ \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |h_k| + (n+1) \left( \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |h_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sum_{k=n+2}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} |h_j|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}. \quad (117)$$

Hence, if  $\{h_n\}$  decays to zero very rapidly (as is the case in most underwater acoustic experiments), we know that  $\hat{R}_p^n(z)$  converges uniformly on  $|z| = 1$  very rapidly to the optimal Hankel-norm rational model  $\hat{R}_p(z)$ . In the next section, we will give an efficient algorithm for computing  $\hat{R}_p^n(z)$ .

## ALGORITHM FOR OPTIMAL RATIONAL MODEL

Let  $\{h_n\}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , be a sequence of unit impulse responses that satisfies

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n| < \infty. \quad (118)$$

(Note that  $H(z) = \sum h_n z^{-n}$  is not necessarily a rational model.) Given a tolerance  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we now give an algorithm for computing a stable (strictly proper) rational function  $R_p(z)$  such that

$$\|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_r \leq \varepsilon. \quad (119)$$

The degree  $p$  will be chosen to be the smallest possible, under the limitation of this method.

### Algorithm III.

(1°) Choose an  $\varepsilon_1$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$  (e.g.  $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ ), and the smallest positive integer  $M_1$ , such that

$$\sum_{n=M_1+1}^{\infty} |h_n| \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad (120)$$

where  $h_{M_1} \neq 0$ .

(2°) Find the singular values

$$s_1^{(1)} \geq s_2^{(1)} \geq \dots \geq s_{M_1}^{(1)} > 0 \quad (121)$$

of the finite Hankel matrix

$$\Gamma_H^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \cdots & h_{M_1} \\ h_2 & & \ddots & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \circ \\ h_{M_1} & & & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (122)$$

and choose the smallest positive integer  $p_1 \leq M_1$  such that

$$s_{p_1}^{(1)} \leq \varepsilon - \varepsilon_1. \quad (123)$$

(One can find the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma_H^{(1)}$  and then take their absolute values to determine the singular values.)

(3°) If  $p_1$  does not exist (i.e., if  $s_{M_1}^{(1)} > \varepsilon - \varepsilon_1$ ), return to (1°) with  $\varepsilon_1$  replaced by

$$\varepsilon_2 = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} \quad (124)$$

and  $M_1$  replaced by  $M_2$ , so chosen that

$$\sum_{n=M_2+1}^{\infty} |h_n| \leq \varepsilon_2 = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} \quad (125)$$

and  $h_{M_2} \neq 0$ .  $M_2 > M_1$ .

Repeat (2°) by finding the singular values

$$s_1^{(2)} \geq s_2^{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq s_{M_2}^{(2)} > 0 \quad (126)$$

of the Hankel matrix

$$\Gamma_H^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \cdots & h_{M_2} \\ h_2 & & \ddots & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \circ \\ h_{M_2} & & & \end{bmatrix} \quad (127)$$

and choosing the smallest  $p_2 \leq M_2$  such that

$$s_{p_2}^{(2)} \leq \varepsilon - \varepsilon_2 \quad (128)$$

(4°) If this fails (i.e. if  $s_{M_2}^{(2)} > \varepsilon - \varepsilon_2$ ), repeat (3°) with

$$\varepsilon_3 = \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}, \quad (129)$$

etc. Suppose that the first time this procedure succeeds is at the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration. That is,  $k$  is the smallest integer such that

$$s_{M_k}^{(k)} \leq \varepsilon - \varepsilon_k = \varepsilon - \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \varepsilon_1, \quad (130)$$

where

$$s_1^{(k)} \geq \dots \geq s_{M_k}^{(k)} > 0 \quad (131)$$

are the singular values of the  $M_k$ -dimensional square Hankel matrix

$$\Gamma_H^{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \dots & h_{M_k} \\ h_2 & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \\ h_{M_k} & & & \bigcirc \end{bmatrix}, \quad (132)$$

with  $h_{M_k} \neq 0$ , and

$$\sum_{n=M_k+1}^{\infty} |h_n| \leq \varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \varepsilon_1. \quad (133)$$

Let  $p_k$  be the smallest integer such that  $s_{p_k}^{(k)} \leq \varepsilon - \varepsilon_k$ , and set

$$p = p_k - 1; \quad (134)$$

so that

$$0 < s_{M_k}^{(k)} \leq s_{p+1}^{(k)} = s_{p_k}^{(k)} \leq \varepsilon - \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \varepsilon_1. \quad (135)$$

(5°) Compute the eigenvalue-eigenvector pair

$$(\lambda_{p+1}, \mathbf{q}^{p+1}) \quad (136)$$

of  $\Gamma_H^{(k)}$ , where  $|\lambda_{p+1}| = s_{p+1}^{(k)}$ .

(6°) Perform the matrix-vector multiplication

$$\mathbf{r}^{p+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & h_1 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & h_1 & \dots & h_{M_k-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}^{p+1}. \quad (137)$$

(7°) Write:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{r}^{p+1} = (b_0, \dots, b_{M_k-1}) \\ \mathbf{q}^{p+1} = (a_0, \dots, a_{M_k-1}) \end{cases}; \quad (138)$$

and compute the singular part

$$R_p(z) = \left[ \frac{b_0 z^{M_k-1} + \cdots + b_{M_k-1}}{a_0 + a_1 z + \cdots + a_{M_k-1} z^{M_k-1}} \right]_s \quad (139)$$

by using partial fractions, retaining only the  $p$  poles in  $|z| < 1$ , counting multiplicities. Then  $R_p(z) \in \mathcal{R}_p^s$  and satisfies

$$\|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_\Gamma \leq \varepsilon. \quad (140)$$

**Proof.** We first remark that  $\det \Gamma_H^{(k)} = (-1)^{M_k} h_{M_k}^{M_k} \neq 0$  so that all the singular values  $s_i^{(k)}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M_k$ , are positive (nonzero). From a well-known result in operator theory (cf. [13]), we have

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq M_k} |s_i - s_i^{(k)}| \leq \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_H^{(k)}\|. \quad (141)$$

On the other hand, it follows from the definition of  $\Gamma_H^{(k)}$  and the second inequality in (23) that

$$\|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_H^{(k)}\| \leq \sum_{n=M_k+1}^{\infty} |h_n|. \quad (142)$$

Hence, by combining (141), (142), and (133), we obtain

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq M_k} |s_i - s_i^{(k)}| \leq \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \varepsilon_1. \quad (143)$$

Now, since  $\{h_n\}$  satisfies (118), we have  $s_n \rightarrow 0$  by (52); so that in view of (143) (where  $M_k$  necessarily tends to infinity, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ), it follows that (130) is satisfied for all sufficiently large values of  $k$ . This shows that the iteration procedure (1°)-(4°) converges.

Next, from the definition of  $\Gamma_H^{(k)}$  in (132), we note that the corresponding rational symbol of  $\Gamma_H^{(k)}$  is

$$H_k(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{M_k} h_i z^{-i} = \frac{h_1 z^{M_k-1} + \cdots + h_{M_k}}{z^{M_k}} = \frac{P(z)}{Q(z)}, \quad (144)$$

where  $\text{degree}(P) < \text{degree}(Q) = M_k$  and  $Q(z) = z^{M_k}$ . Since the reciprocal polynomial of  $Q(z)$  is  $Q^*(z) = 1$ , we have

$$\frac{Q^*(z)}{Q(z)} = z^{-M_k}. \quad (145)$$

Hence, using the notations from (92) and (94) with  $M$  replaced by  $M_k$ , we have:

$$K_{M_k} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \bigcirc \\ & \ddots & \\ \bigcirc & & 1 \end{bmatrix}, K_\Delta = [\bigcirc]. \quad (146)$$

Also, again from the definition of  $\Gamma_H^{(k)}$  in (132), using the notations from (91) and (93) with  $M = M_k$ , we have:

$$H_{M_k} = \Gamma_H^{(k)} \quad (147)$$

and

$$H_\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & h_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & h_1 & \dots & h_{M_k-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (148)$$

This yields

$$\begin{cases} (H_{M_k} - \lambda K_{M_k})\mathbf{q} = \Gamma_H^{(k)}\mathbf{q} - \lambda\mathbf{q} \\ (H_\Delta - \lambda K_\Delta)\mathbf{q} = H_\Delta\mathbf{q}. \end{cases} \quad (149)$$

Hence, Step (1°) in Kung's algorithm (i.e. Algorithm II) is equivalent to

$$\Gamma_H^{(k)}\mathbf{q}^{p+1} = \lambda_{p+1}\mathbf{q}^{p+1}, \quad (150)$$

and Step (2°) in Kung's algorithm (i.e. Algorithm II) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{r}^{p+1} = H_\Delta\mathbf{q}^{p+1}. \quad (151)$$

Since (150) is the same as Step (5°) and (151) is the same as Step (6°) in Algorithm III, we have proved that  $R_p(z)$ , as defined in (139), satisfies

$$\|R_p(z) - H_k(z)\|_\Gamma = s_{p+1}^{(k)}, \quad (152)$$

where  $H_k(z)$  is defined in (144). Hence, by applying the triangle inequality and the information from (142), (133), (152), and (135) consecutively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_\Gamma &= \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_{R_p}\| & (153) \\ &\leq \|\Gamma_H - \Gamma_H^{(k)}\| + \|\Gamma_H^{(k)} - \Gamma_{R_p}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=M_k+1}^{\infty} |h_n| + \|R_p(z) - H_k(z)\|_\Gamma \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\varepsilon_1 + s_{p+1}^{(k)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\varepsilon_1 + \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\varepsilon_1\right) = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (140).

**Remarks.** Algorithm III can be easily adapted and modified to produce a possibly lower degree rational model  $R_p(z)$  that satisfies the design criterion (119). In fact, as a consequence of Theorem 5, we can theoretically obtain the lowest degree optimal Hankel-norm

rational model  $\hat{R}_p(z)$  in the limiting case. One suggestion is to repeat this algorithm for various values of  $\varepsilon_1$ , such that

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\ell}{L} \varepsilon, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L-1, \quad (154)$$

for a suitably large integer  $L$ . As to the modification of the algorithm itself, one may wish to try various values of  $\varepsilon_i$ ,  $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$ , instead of  $\varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_3 = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{2^2}\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\varepsilon_1$  as suggested in (124), (129), and (130). The only restriction is that  $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_3 > \dots > \varepsilon_k$ . The smaller the values of  $\varepsilon_\ell - \varepsilon_{\ell-1}$ ,  $\ell = 2, \dots, k$ , chosen, the better the chance is to find the lowest degree rational model  $\hat{R}_p(z)$ . Of course, more computing time is required.

We also remark that although the Hankel-norm specification in (119) is not as desirable as the supremum (or uniform) norm specification, it is very close to it, in view of Nehari's theorem (i.e. Theorem 2), since the only thing that can go wrong is an  $H^\infty$  (or analytic) additive factor which only contributes to noncausal information. In addition, the Hankel-norm specification is more desirable than the  $L^2$  norm (or RMS) specification, since it follows from (31) that

$$\|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_{L^2} \leq \|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_\Gamma, \quad (155)$$

where  $L^2 = L^2(|z| = 1)$  and  $H(z)$  is assumed to be causal, in the sense that  $H(z) = H_s(z)$  or

$$H(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^n, \quad (156)$$

where  $\{h_n\}$  satisfies (118). Hence, as a consequence of (154), if  $R_p(z)$  satisfies the design criterion  $\|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_\Gamma \leq \varepsilon$ , it also satisfies the design criterion  $\|H(z) - R_p(z)\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon$ .

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT:** The author would like to thank Mr. David George, Signalmetrics, Inc. Winter Park, FL, for his many helpful comments, constant interest, and encouragement.

## REFERENCES

1. A.S. Willsky, *Digital Signal Processing and Control and Estimation Theory* (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1979).
2. C.K. Chui and G. Chen, *Selected Topics in Signal Processing and Systems Theory* (Springer-Verlag, N.Y., publication pending).
3. V.M. Adamjan, D.Z. Arov, and M.G. Krein, "Analytic properties of Schmidt pairs for a Hankel operator and the generalized Schur-Takagi problem," *Math. USSR Sbornik*, **15**, 31-73 (1971).
4. F.R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices*, Vol. II (Chelsea Pub. Co., N.Y., 1966).
5. Z. Nehari, "On bounded bilinear forms," *Ann. Math.*, **65**, 153-162 (1967).

6. S.Y. Kung, "Optimal Hankel-norm model reductions: scalar systems," Proc. Joint Auto. Control, Paper FA8-D, 1980.
7. C.K. Chui, X. Li, and J.D. Ward, "System reduction via truncated Hankel matrices," *Math. of Cont., Signals, and Systems*, in press.
8. C.K. Chui, X. Li, and J.D. Ward, "Rate of uniform convergence of rational functions corresponding to best approximations of truncated Hankel operators," *Math. of Cont., Signals, and Systems*, in press.
9. C.K. Chui, "Identification of Underwater Acoustic Device ARMA Models By Modified Best Hankel-Norm Approximation Using Input-Output Data," being written as possible NRL Report.
10. W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis* (McGraw-Hill, Inc., N.Y., 1973).
11. C.K. Chui, "Estimation of Time-of-Arrival of Underwater Acoustic Signals By Spline Functions, I. An Introduction," NRL Memorandum Report 6572, (publication pending).
12. B.A. Francis, *A Course in  $H^\infty$ -Control Theory* (Springer-Verlag, N.Y., 1987).
13. I. Gohberg and M.G. Krein, *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Nonselfadjoint Operators* (Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ., Providence, R.I., 1969).

## APPENDIX

Since it is important to be able to relate a rational model

$$H(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n z^{-n} = \frac{P(z)}{Q(z)}, \quad (157)$$

where  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are coprime polynomials satisfying

$$\text{degree}(P) < \text{degree}(Q) = M, \quad (158)$$

with the infinite Hankel matrix

$$\Gamma_H = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & h_3 & \cdots \\ h_2 & h_3 & \cdots & \cdots \\ h_3 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (159)$$

we include in this Appendix a proof of Kronecker's theorem given as Theorem 1 on page 2. To be consistent with the notation in (6), let

$$\gamma_i = (h_i, h_{i+1}, \dots) \quad (160)$$

denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column vector of  $\Gamma_H$ . We also need the notation

$$H_M^i = \begin{bmatrix} h_i & \dots & h_{i+M-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_{i+M-1} & \dots & h_{i+2M-2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (161)$$

for the  $M$ -dimensional cofactors of  $\Gamma_H$  with leading entry  $h_i$ . Then

$$H_M^1 = H_M \quad (162)$$

is the principle cofactor of  $\Gamma_H$  of dimension  $M$  introduced in (7) and (91). We have the following preliminary result.

**Lemma 1.** *The infinite Hankel matrix  $\Gamma_H$  has finite rank  $= k$  if and only if the first  $k$  column vectors  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$  of  $\Gamma_H$  are linearly independent and there exist  $k$  numbers  $c_1, \dots, c_k$  such that*

$$\gamma_{k+\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \gamma_{i+\ell-1}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots \quad (163)$$

Furthermore, if  $\text{rank } \Gamma_H = k < \infty$ , then the principal cofactor  $H_k^1 = H_k$  is a nonsingular square matrix.

**Proof.** By definition,  $\text{rank } \Gamma_H < \infty$  if and only if  $\Gamma_H$  has only a finite number of linearly independent columns. Suppose  $\text{rank } \Gamma_H < \infty$ . Let  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$  be linearly dependent; and let  $k$  be the largest integer,  $1 \leq k < r$ , such that  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$  are linearly independent. Then since  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k+1}$  are linearly dependent, there exist constants  $c_1, \dots, c_k$  such that

$$\gamma_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \gamma_i. \quad (164)$$





which, by the same argument as the proof of Lemma 1, yields

$$\gamma_{M+\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^M c_i \gamma_{i+\ell-1}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots \quad (171)$$

Since  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are coprime and the leading coefficient of  $Q(z)$  is normalized to be 1, the set of coefficients  $\{a_i\}$ , and hence  $\{c_i\}$ , in (170) is unique. That is,  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M$  are linearly independent. Hence, by Lemma 1,  $\text{rank } \Gamma_H = M$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\text{rank } \Gamma_H = M$ . Then by Lemma 1, we can find coefficients  $c_1, \dots, c_M$ , such that (171) holds. Hence, defining  $a_1, \dots, a_M$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_M$  by (169) and (167), respectively, we have both (167) and (168), which yields (166); or equivalently, we have  $H(z) = P(z)/Q(z)$  by using (165) to define  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$ . The linear independence of  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M$  is equivalent to the uniqueness of  $\{a_i\}$  and  $\{b_i\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , which, in turn, implies that  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are coprime.